



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,497	02/06/2004	David K. McKnight	CA919990017US2	6632
58139	7590	10/30/2007		
IBM CORP. (WSM) c/o WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C. P.O. BOX 50784 DALLAS, TX 75201			EXAMINER PATEL, MANGLESH M	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/30/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/773,497

Applicant(s)

MCKNIGHT ET AL.

Examiner

Manglesh M. Patel

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14,15,37-39 and 44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14,15,37-39 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/01/2007</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This **FINAL** action is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/14/2007 and IDS filed on 10/1/2007.
2. Claims 1-13, 16-36 and 40-43 are canceled from the previous restriction requirement in application 09/489793, Claims 14-15, 37-39 and 44 are pending. Claims 14 & 37 are independent claims.

Withdrawn Rejections

3. The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections of claims 14 & 37 have been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 10/01/2007 has been entered, and considered by the examiner. (Note: Although the reference has been considered by the Examiner, the Medich et al. U.S. 5,276,155 reference deals with the chemical arts having no relation to computer technology whatsoever. Examiner advises applicant to review the reference since it is believed to be an error.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 14-15, 37-39 and 44 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lie et al. (Cascading Style Sheets, Level 1, W3C, Jan 1999, pgs 1-70).

Regarding Independent claim 14 and 37, A method for generating an output document in a user preferred style, comprising the steps of: reading an example file representing said user preferred style into an input buffer; searching said input buffer for a pattern that matches that of an expected section; if said pattern is found, from the position of said pattern, defining a first bound by searching backwards in said buffer until a previous expected search pattern is found; from the position of said pattern, defining a second bound by

searching forwards in said buffer until a next expected search pattern is found; copying a string of characters contained within said input buffer between said first bound and said second bound to a template buffer; parsing said template buffer to isolate expected keywords, and names and subsections; if said expected section is a section that can be repeated in a document, saving in said template buffer the line offsets of keywords, names and other elements; replacing content-specific subsections with macro names; and if said pattern is not found, creating a default template buffer for said expected section.

Lie teaches the application of a Cascading Style Sheet for formatting output documents such as HTML web pages in a style preferred by a user (pg 6, section 1). He teaches that the application of a CSS allows the generation of an output document in a user preferred style. He first teaches an example file which is the CSS defined by a user and includes all the user preferred style which is read into an input buffer or memory via parsing operation done by the browser. Furthermore he states that the web browser must be aware of the existence of the style sheet (pg 6, sections 1 & 1.1). He then shows that an external style sheet being references several ways, one which includes using a LINK element with an Href attribute to access the example file. Once the external style sheet/example file is referenced the code portion or expected section defined in section 1.1 on page 6 denoted by <H1> is compared with the definition or selector defined in the example file such as H1 {color: blue } described on pg 6, section 1, this being done during the parsing operation by the browser which is searching an input buffer or memory. Once the selector or pattern which is the match between the selector of the external style sheet/example file and the expected section in the output document is found, a first bound and second bound are searched. These bounds are denoted by the { } parenthesis used to define the style definition associated with the selector and disclosed in section 1 on page 6. Furthermore if the expected section such has H1 in the output document is repeated the referenced external stylesheet is stored in memory to access the keywords, names and other elements defined in the example file such has the style definition associated with the selector h1. Furthermore if the pattern is not found than a default template is used. This default template is describe by Lie in section 1 page 6, he states "HTML authors need to write style sheets only if they want to suggest a specific style for their documents. Each User Agent (UA, often a web browser or web client) will have a default style sheet that presents documents in a reasonable—but arguably mundane manner." Furthermore Lie states in pg 15 section 3 "By default, the weights of the reader's rules are less than the weights of rules in the author's documents. I.e., if there are conflicts between the style sheets of an incoming document and the reader's personal sheets,

the author's rules will be used. Both reader and author rules override the UA's default values." Here Lie suggests the use of a default template for an expected section with no user defined style being referenced, which is accomplished by the browser. Lie simply describes parsing done by the browser to be able to apply an external CSS to a web document, he fails to explicitly describe the process of backwards and forward searching of patterns in the buffer. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to associate backward and forward searching of patterns in an input buffer. Such searching is merely a parsing operation used to determine selector definitions to associate with the HTML document prior to the application of the style sheet and generation of the desired output document. The motivation for doing so would have been to apply a CSS to an HTML document by searching the external stylesheet selectors, hence resulting in an output document in a user preferred style.

Regarding Dependent claims 15, 38 and 44, Getting a said template buffer for each section to be generated in said output document; getting user content for all sections of said output document; creating an output buffer for storing said output document; for each section of said output document, putting a corresponding template buffer into a temporary output buffer; replacing macro names in said temporary output buffer with user content information: if this section is expected to be repeated and the user desires alignment, using corresponding template offsets to modify said temporary output buffer for aligning keywords, names, and other sub-sections; inserting the content of said temporary output buffer into said output buffer; and writing said output buffer to a file.

Lie teaches accessing selectors (sections) defined in an external style sheet which include content for sections of an output document (see pg 6, sections 1 and 1.1). The process of applying an External stylesheet to an HTML document includes replacing macro names or ID selectors as defined in section 1.5 on page 9, with content information which is simply the defined user style in the example file. Furthermore if the expected section such as H1 in the output document is repeated the referenced external stylesheet is stored in memory to access the keywords, names and other elements defined in the example file such as the style definition associated with the selector h1.

Dependent claim 39, the claims describe a program storage device that performs the method steps of claim 14 and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/14/2007 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant Argues: Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches reading an example file representing a user preferred style into an input buffer. (see pg 7, paragraph 3)

Neither is there any language in the cited passages that teaches searching an input buffer for a pattern that matches that of an expected section. (pg 8, paragraph 1)

Applicant further assert that Lie does not teach "copying a string of characters contained within said input buffer between said first bound and said second bound to a template buffer" (pg 11, paragraph 2)

Applicant further assert that Lie does not teach "parsing said template buffer to isolate expected keywords, and names and subsections" (pg 11, paragraph 4)

Applicant further assert that Lie does not teach replacing content-specific subsections with macro names (pg 13, paragraph 1)

Applicant further assert that Lie does not teach if said pattern is not found creating a default template buffer for said expected sections. (pg 13, paragraph 4)

However The Examiner respectfully disagrees: Lie teaches the application of a Cascading Style Sheet for formatting output documents such as HTML web pages in a style preferred by a user (pg 6, section 1). He teaches that the application of a CSS allows the generation of an output document in a user preferred style.

He first teaches an example file which is the CSS defined by a user and includes all the user preferred style which is read into an input buffer or memory via parsing operation done by the browser. Furthermore he states that the web browser must be aware of the existence of the style sheet (pg 6, sections 1 & 1.1). He then shows that an external style sheet being references several ways, one which includes using a LINK element with an Href attribute to access the example file. Once the external style sheet/example file is referenced the code portion or expected section defined in section 1.1 on page 6 denoted by <H1> is compared with the definition or selector defined in the example file such as H1 {color: blue } described on pg 6, section 1, this being done during the parsing operation by the browser which is searching an input buffer or memory. Once the selector or pattern which is the match between the selector of the external style sheet/example file and the expected section in the output document is found, a first bound and second bound are searched. These bounds are denoted by the { } parenthesis used to define the style definition associated with the selector and disclosed in section 1 on page 6. Furthermore if the expected section such has H1 in the output document is repeated the referenced external stylesheet is stored in memory to access the keywords, names and other elements defined in the example file such has the style definition associated with the selector h1. Furthermore if the pattern is not found than a default template is used. This default template is describe by Lie in section 1 page 6, he states "HTML authors need to write style sheets only if they want to suggest a specific style for their documents. Each User Agent (UA, often a web browser or web client) will have a default style sheet that presents documents in a reasonable—but arguably mundane manner." Furthermore Lie states in pg 15 section 3 "By default, the weights of the reader's rules are less than the weights of rules in the author's documents. I.e., if there are conflicts between the style sheets of an incoming document and the reader's personal sheets, the author's rules will be used. Both reader and author rules override the UA's default values." Here lie suggests the use of a default template for an expected section with no user defined style being referenced, which is accomplished by the browser. Lie simply describes parsing done by the browser to be able to apply an external CSS to a web document, he fails to explicitly describe the process of backwards and forward searching of patterns in the buffer. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to associate backward and forward searching of patterns in an input buffer. Such searching is merely a parsing operation used to determine selector definitions to associate with the HTML document prior to the application of the style sheet and generation of the desired output document. The motivation for doing so would have been to apply a CSS to

an HTML document by searching the external stylesheet selectors, hence resulting in an output document in a user preferred style.

It is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Sheckler, 168 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1971); In re McLaughlin 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971); In re Young 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968).

Further more as to the reason to combine not being the same as applicant's.

If it is obvious to combine references for one reason it is obvious to combine references for all reasons. In re Graf, 145 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1965); In re Finsterwalder 168 USPQ 530 (USPQ 1970); In re Kronig, 539 F.2d 1300, 190 USPQ 425 (CCPA 1976). In re Dillon, 892 F.2d 1544, 13 USPQ 1337 (1989); In re Dillon 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 1897 Fed. Cir. 1990) (in bane).

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

(NOTE: Unless a proposed amendment is submitted to the claims. The examiner urges applicant to avoid contacting the examiner for an interview since prosecution is closed, only written responses will be considered via After Final Amendments. Further there has been no attempt to advance prosecution of the

Art Unit: 2178

application in this response or any indication thereof. Therefore the Examiner advises the applicant to exercise C.F.R. 1.191).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
October 19, 2007



**CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER**